

SID WOLINSKY (SBN 33716)  
Disability Rights Advocates  
2001 Center Street, Fourth Floor  
Berkeley, California 94704-1204  
Telephone: (510) 665-8644  
Facsimile: (510) 665-8511  
TTY: (510) 665-8716  
Email: general@dralegal.org

Attorney for Plaintiffs

JOHN A. RUSSO, City Attorney (SBN 129729)  
RANDOLPH W. HALL, Assistant City Attorney (SBN 080142)  
WILLIAM E. SIMMONS, Supervising Trial Attorney (SBN 121286)  
STEPHEN Q. ROWELL, Deputy City Attorney (SBN 098228)  
One Frank Ogawa Plaza, 6th Floor  
Oakland, California 94612  
Telephone: (510) 238-6520 Fax: (510) 238-6500  
Email: sqrowell@oaklandcityattorney.org

Attorneys for Defendants

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CALIFORNIA FOUNDATION FOR  
INDEPENDENT LIVING CENTERS;  
CALIFORNIANS FOR DISABILITY  
RIGHTS, INC.; and MARIAN GRAY,  
Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. C 07-04608 EDL

Hearing

Date: December 18, 2007  
Time: 10:00 am  
Location: Courtroom E  
Judge: Laporte

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT  
STATEMENT**

DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES  
2001 CENTER STREET, FOURTH FLOOR  
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94704-1204  
(510) 665-8644

ITS ADVOCATES  
ET, FOURTH FLOOR  
RMA 94704-1204  
5-8644

1 The parties hereby submit the following Joint Case Management Statement for use at the Case  
2 Management Conference.

3 **1. Jurisdiction and Service**

4 This court has jurisdiction over this matter under the laws of the United States, as  
5 provided in 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and, further, as it arises out of an Act of Congress known as 29  
6 U.S.C. § 1446. All defendants have been served with this action.

7 **2. Facts**

8 Plaintiffs filed a complaint in August 2007 alleging that Defendant City of Oakland is not  
9 prepared to meet the unique needs of people with disabilities during an emergency. Oakland  
10 maintains a disaster preparedness plan administered through its Office of Emergency Services  
11 (OES). OES plans for mass evacuation, temporary shelter needs, recovery animal care and  
12 special needs populations. Plaintiffs contend that potential shelter facilities are physically  
13 inaccessible (multiple levels with no elevators, no Braille signage, doorways that are too narrow,  
14 or restrooms and/or showers that are completely inaccessible to wheelchair users), and that  
15 Oakland's policies, procedures, and plans for people with disabilities are inadequate or non-  
16 existent. Plaintiffs also allege that the City lacks comprehensive information about the  
17 accessibility of potential shelter sites and thus that it cannot provide accessible sheltering options  
18 to people with disabilities or provide equal access to its shelter services. The City denies these  
19 contentions.

20 **3. Legal Issues**

21 Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") prohibits a public entity from  
22 excluding a person with a disability from participating in, or denying the benefits of, the goods,  
23 services, programs and activities of the entity or otherwise discriminating against a person on the  
24 basis of disability. 42 U.S.C. § 12132. Plaintiffs argue that by failing to plan to meet the mass  
25 care and shelter needs of people with disabilities, Defendants have excluded them from  
26 participation in, denied them the benefits of, and discriminated against them in its mass care and  
27 shelter program and services in violation of this statute. Plaintiffs also argue that Defendants  
28

1 have violated (a) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794, which prohibits  
 2 discrimination against people with disabilities by recipients of federal funding; (b) California  
 3 Civil Code § 54, *et seq.*, by denying Plaintiffs full and equal access to and use and enjoyment of  
 4 emergency shelter facilities and services due to the acts and omissions alleged herein; and (c)  
 5 California Government Code § 11135 and the regulations promulgated thereunder, which  
 6 prohibit discrimination against people with disabilities by any program or activity funded by the  
 7 State.

8 Defendants deny these allegations. Defendants contend that plaintiffs lack standing and  
 9 that their claims are not ripe.

#### 10 **4. Motions**

11 No motions are currently pending.

#### 12 **5. Amendment of Pleadings**

13 Neither party currently plans to amend the pleadings.

#### 14 **6. Evidence Preservation**

15 Both parties have taken steps to preserve evidence reasonably relevant to the issues  
 16 reasonably evident in this action.

#### 17 **7. Disclosures**

18 The parties have stipulated, and the Court ordered on November 17, 2007, that the parties  
 19 be relieved of the requirements imposed by Federal Rule 26(f), including the initial disclosure  
 20 requirements.

#### 21 **8. Discovery**

22 Waived by stipulation and so ordered, see (7) above.

#### 23 **9. Class Actions**

24 Not applicable.

#### 25 **10. Related Cases**

26 None.

#### 27 **11. Relief**

1 Plaintiffs pray for relief as follows: (a) A declaration that Defendants' failure to  
 2 adequately plan to meet the emergency mass care and shelter needs of people with disabilities  
 3 violates the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, California  
 4 Civil Code § 54, *et seq.*, and California Government Code § 11135, *et seq.*; (b) An order and  
 5 judgment enjoining Defendants from violating the above, and requiring Defendants to  
 6 comprehensively survey the accessibility of all potential shelter sites and develop and implement  
 7 a mass care and shelter plan that addresses the emergency needs of people with disabilities; (c)  
 8 Plaintiffs' reasonable attorneys' fees and costs; and (d) Such other and further relief as the Court  
 9 deems just and proper.

#### 10 **12. Settlement and ADR**

11 The Parties are optimistic about the possibility of settlement. Pursuant to the Court's  
 12 Order, Magistrate Judge Bernard Zimmerman was assigned to preside over the settlement  
 13 process. He recused himself on December 12, 2007, and the settlement process was reassigned  
 14 to Magistrate Judge James Larson.

#### 15 **13. Consent to Magistrate Judge for All Purposes**

16 The parties have consented to have a Magistrate Judge conduct all further proceedings  
 17 including trial and entry of judgment.

#### 18 **14. Other references**

19 Not applicable.

#### 20 **15. Narrowing of Issues**

21 None necessary at this time.

#### 22 **16. Expedited Schedule**

23 Not applicable.

#### 24 **17. Scheduling**

25 The parties suggest that this be deferred until a future case management conference.

#### 26 **18. Trial**

27 Bench trial, since Plaintiffs seek equitable relief and not damages.

#### 28 **19. Disclosure of Non-party Interested Entities or Persons**

1 None known to the parties.

2  
3 **20. Other**

4 The parties believe that continued settlement discussions under the supervision of a  
5 Magistrate Judge is the best course at this time.

6  
7 Dated: December 11, 2007

DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES

8  
9 By: 

SID WOLINSKY

Attorney for Plaintiffs

10  
11  
12  
13 Dated: December 11, 2007

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY

14  
15  
16 By: 

STEPHEN Q. ROWELL

JOHN A. RUSSO

RANDOLPH W. HALL

WILLIAM E. SIMMONS

Attorneys for Defendants

DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES  
2001 CENTER STREET, FLOOR 11 E-008  
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94704-1204  
(510) 663-8644

27  
28  
CFLIC v. Oakland, Case No.: C 07-04608 EDL  
Joint Case Management Statement